

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/459,670	12/13/1999	MARK T JEFFREY	200868	1464
7590 12/08/2003			EXAMINER	
LEYDIG VOIT & MAYER LTD			MOLINARI, MICHAEL J	
TWO PRUDENTIAL PLAZA SUITE 4900 180 NORTH STETSON			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CHICAGO, IL 606016780			2665	·
			DATE MAILED: 12/08/2003	3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advison: Action	09/459,670	JEFFREY ET AL.			
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Michael J Molinari	2665			
The MAILING DATE of this communication and					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address THE REPLY FILED 13 November 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.					
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]					
<ul> <li>a)</li></ul>					
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
1 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:					
(a) ☑ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);					
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or					
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.					
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).					
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .					
The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	•				
Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)					
10. Other:					
		ALPUS H. HSU PRIMARY EXAMINER			

Confinuation Sheet (PTOL-303) 009/459,670

Application No.

Continuation of 2. NOTE: Each of the independent claims has been amended to incorporate limitations not previously contained in any of the claims.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant has argued that the teaching of Hamami does not apply to the claimed invention because Hamami refers to conventional ATM connection setup, which is different from connecting an ATM network to a LAN. Examiner, however, has shown that Burwell et al. teach the need to perform an ATM virtual circuit setup from an ingress node to an egress node and that Hamami shows how to perform an ATM virtual circuit setup. Applicant has not shown how it would be different in an ATM-LAN connection combination nor why the two references cannot or should not be combined. Therefore, the examiner maintains the rejection on the basis that Burwell et al. and Hamami have been properly combined.